

Remarks

Claims 1, 2, 4-20, and 22-65 were rejected. In the present response, claim 9 is cancelled, claims 1, 4, 5, 19, 22, 23, 33, 35, 37, 39, 40, 50, 52-54, 64, and 65 are amended, and claims 66-67 are added. No new matter has been added.

Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-20, and 22-67 are pending and under consideration.

Specification

On page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner states that the term “computer readable medium” which is recited in claims 64 and 65 is unclear. Applicants respectfully disagree. However, in order to expedite prosecution, the term “computer readable medium” has been amended to either “computer readable storage medium” or “computer readable storage device”.

Support for the computer readable storage medium/device may be found in Paragraphs [0041] and [0042], where Applicants disclose and discuss a computer readable “distribution medium” and “storage devices” including a diskette, hard drive, CDROM, etc.

Applicants thus respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

On pages 3-4 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 64 and 65 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that the “computer readable medium” recited by claims 64 and 65 is not statutory subject matter.

As note above, the term “computer readable medium” has been amended to either “computer readable storage medium” or “computer readable storage device” thus obviating the rejection of the claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 16-20, 22-28, 31-45, 48-59, and 62-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over US Patent Publication No. 2001/0054064 to Kannan (“Kannan”) in view of US Patent No. 5,907,680 to Nielsen (“Nielsen”).

Claim 1 provides a method comprising determining based at least in part on content of a locator of a first information page requested to be retrieved and displayed on a client system, whether to provide information browsing assistance for the first information page, said determining including analyzing the content of the locator of the first information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a pre-specified locator pattern corresponding to a plurality of additional locators of a plurality of additional locations having additional complementary or related information that amplifies information of the first information page; and conditionally providing said information browsing assistance based at least in part on said determination, the information browsing assistance including all or a portion of the additional complementary or related information.

Paragraphs [0025] and [0091] of Kannan are cited for the features of determining based at least in part on content of a locator of a first information page ... requested to be retrieved and displayed on a client system, whether to provide information browsing assistance for the first information page ...and conditionally providing said information browsing assistance based at least in part on said determination, as recited in claim 1. The cited portions of Kannan indicate that the browsing activity of the user may be used to determine if the user needs browsing assistance. For example, if the user has gone back and forth between web sites, a determination may be made that the user is lost and needs help. This teaching is in contrast to the noted portion of claim 1 that indicates that browsing assistance is based on analysis of the content of the locator. Thus, claim 1 provides a system that analyzes the content of the locator (such as a URL) whereas Kannan teaches monitoring the activity of the user to identify unusual browsing behavior. The teaching of Kannan is thus quite different.

For the feature of analyzing the content of the locator of the first information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a pre-specified locator pattern corresponding to a plurality of additional locators of a plurality of additional locations having additional complementary or related information that amplifies information of the first information page, the Office Action cites Nielson. But, Nielson fails to teach or suggest these features.

In general terms, Nielson teaches that when a URL is manually entered by a user, the text of the URL is spell-checked and a list of potential URLs is generated and displayed to

the user, enabling the user to select one of the potential URLs having text that incorporates a modified spelling. The potential URLs are not necessarily accurate URLs, but rather the words/terms therein have been checked for proper spelling. The accuracy of the URLs is determined by manually clicking on the URL to see if it corresponds to an accurate URL or not. If not, the user is directed to continue down the list of potential URLs containing alternate spellings.

At no point in Nielsen is there any teaching or suggestion of determining whether the locator satisfies a pre-specified locator pattern, as recited in claim 1. Further, Nielsen does not provide any teaching or suggestion of a pre-specified pattern that corresponds to a plurality of additional locators of a plurality of additional locations having additional complementary or related information that amplifies information of the first information page, as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 provides for recognizing when a locator of a first information page corresponds to a pre-specified pattern to provide in-turn additional complementary or related information to amplify the first information page. By contrast, in Nielsen, a determination is made as to the accuracy of the URL when it has been determined that the originally entered URL did not work. In response, the URL is run through a spell-checker to look for misspelled words. In Nielsen, the URL is not correlated to a pre-specified pattern.

For the teaching of a locator pattern, Column 3, lines 1-11, of Nielsen is cited, which states as follows:

The invention also relates to apparatus for checking spelling of network addresses received at a server having a hierarchical directory structure from a remote user, including a database containing names of hidden files, and a computer configured to analyze network addresses term by term beyond the server address, to compare portions of an address with corresponding portions of the server directory and to present to the remote user one or more alternative spellings if a directory or file name does not match identically a valid entry in the hierarchical directory, unless such an alternative spelling is contained in the database.

The cited portion of Nielsen clearly indicates that the network address is parsed and the individual portions are checked for proper spelling if the provided spelling does not already exist in the server. Alternative spellings are provided if a directory or file name does not

match identically a valid entry in the directory. The cited portion of Nielsen thus provides a mechanism for a network address to be spell-checked by comparing term by term the portions of the address with corresponding portions of the server directory to identify misspelled portions. If misspellings are found, alternatives are provided. However, such a description does not determine whether the network address is composed of any particular pattern or structural format that may or may not correspond to a pre-specified locator pattern which in-turn corresponds to a plurality of additional locators of a plurality of additional locations, such as recited in claim 1.

In addition, in Nielsen, a single URL is spell-checked and potential new spellings are provided. A plurality of additional locators of a plurality of additional locations having additional complementary or related information that amplifies information of the first information page are not provided. Nielsen is not intended or used to amplify the first information page, but rather is intended to provide an alternative URL when the first attempt to access a URL is unsuccessful. In Nielsen, the only connection between the locations associated with the potential URLs and the first information page is that their locators each include at least one word that is spelled similarly to a word from the originally entered URL.

Thus, Nielsen differs from the teachings of claim 1 for a variety of reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kannan and Nielson fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1 and that claim 1 is therefore patentable over the combination of Kannan and Nielson.

Independent claims 19, 35, 50, 64, and 65 recite similar elements to those of claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 19, 35, 50, 64, and 65 are patentable over Kannan and Nielson under §103.

Claims 2, 4-8, 10-13, 16-18, 20, 22-28, 31-34, 36-45, 48, 49, 51-59, 62, and 63 depend from claims 1, 19, 35, 50, 64, and 65, incorporating their elements, respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons above, Applicants submit that claims 2, 4-8, 10-13, 16-18, 20, 22-28, 31-34, 36-45, 48, 49, 51-59, 62, and 63 are patentable over Kannan and Nielson under §103.

2. On page 17 of the above-captioned Office Action, claims 14, 15, 29, 30, 46, 47, 60 and 61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kannan in view of Nielson in further view of US Patent No. 6,026,409 issued to Blumenthal ("Blumenthal").

Claims 14, 15, 29, 30, 46, 47, 60 and 61 depend from claims 1, 19, 35, and 50, respectively, incorporating their elements. As discussed above, claims 1, 19, 35, and 50 are patentable over the combination of Kannan and Nielson, and Blumenthal fails to remedy the deficiencies of the combination. Blumenthal is merely cited as teaching modifying an environmental attribute of a browsing environment and for teaching a number of environmental attributes. Thus, for at least this reason, Applicants submit that claims 14, 15, 29, 30, 46, 47, 60 and 61 are patentable over Kannan and Nielson in view of Blumenthal.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2844. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: October 29, 2008

by: /Steven J. Prewitt/
Steven J. Prewitt
Reg. No.: 45,023

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97222
Telephone: 503-222-9981